

PATENT
Serial No.: 09/690,368
Docket No. 28150.11
Customer No. 000027683

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 24 have been amended. Claims 1-24 are pending. Antecedent basis for the amendments is located throughout Applicant's specification, as for example in the description at page 16, line 15 through page 18, line 27. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered.

Pending claims

The Office Action states, incorrectly, that: (a) only claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, and 21-24 are pending in this case; and (b) claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 19 and 20 were cancelled in Applicant's Supplemental Preliminary Amendment filed in August, 2002 ("Preliminary Amendment").

In fact, the Preliminary Amendment did *not* cancel any claims. At page 6, the Preliminary Amendment states, "Claims 1-24 are pending."

Rejection of the claims

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,694,484 ("Mueller").

As amended, claim 1 recites:

1. A method performed by a computer system, comprising:
storing a version of a mass-produced printed paper; and
forming a link within the version between a first location within the paper and a second location, the version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper, and the first location being: displayable on the display device as part of the likeness; highlighted to indicate the link; and selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location.

Mueller fails to teach the combination of elements in amended claim 1. MPEP § 2143.01 states: "The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does *not* render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." As stated in MPEP § 2142, "...The examiner bears the initial burden of

PATENT
Serial No.: 09/690,368
Docket No. 28150.11
Customer No. 000027683

factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness..."

In fact, Mueller actually teaches away from the combination of elements in amended claim 1. For example, at col. 6, lines 12-19, Mueller states, "An association tag, for purposes of the present disclosure, is a declarative HTML tag that includes a marker and an index reference. An example of an association tag that is implemented as a comment tag is <!marker index reference=xxx.xxx style=invisible>. Because the tag is declarative, it will not be visible when the HTML document is displayed on the screen display device 20" (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Mueller teaches away from displaying an indication of the association tag, and Mueller therefore contradicts the combination of elements in amended claim 1, which recites: "the first location being: displayable on the display device as part of the likeness; highlighted to indicate the link; and selectable by a user." Thus, in relation to amended claim 1, Mueller fails to teach, or even suggest, any basis for combining in a 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection.

MPEP § 2142 states: "...the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical 'person of ordinary skill in the art' when the invention was unknown and just before it was made...The examiner must put aside knowledge of the applicant's disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed 'as a whole.'" Thus, when evaluating a claim for determining obviousness, all limitations of the claim must be evaluated.

In relation to amended claim 1, the motivation for advantageously combining the claimed elements would arise solely from hindsight based on Applicant's teachings in its own specification. Accordingly, the PTO's burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met.

Thus, in view of the reasons stated herein, and for other reasons clearly apparent, the PTO has not met its burden of factually supporting a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness in this case, and Applicant has no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.

PATENT
 Serial No.: 09/690,368
 Docket No. 28150.11
 Customer No. 000027683

In relation to claims 9 and 17, Mueller is likewise defective in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Conclusion

For these reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 9 and 17.

Dependent claims 2-8 depend from and further limit claim 1 and therefore are allowable.

Dependent claims 10-16 depend from and further limit claim 9 and therefore are allowable.

Dependent claims 18-24 depend from and further limit claim 17 and therefore are allowable.

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-24 is requested.

To the extent that this Response to Office Action results in additional fees, the Commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account no. 08-1394.

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. If any unresolved aspect remains, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Davis, Jr.
 Registration No. 35,488

Date: 12/21/2004
 HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
 901 Main Street, Suite 3100
 Dallas, Texas 75202
 Telephone: 512/867-8458
 Facsimile: 214/200-0853
 Docket No. 28150.11

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below:	
Fax Number: (703) 872-0308	
<u>Melissa Campbell</u>	
TYPE OR PRINT NAME	<u>Melissa Campbell</u>
SIGNATURE	<u>Melissa Campbell</u>
December 21, 2004	
DATE OF TRANSMISSION	